

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

STATE OF MISSOURI; MICHAEL L. PARSON,  
Governor of the State of Missouri, in his official  
capacity; and ANDREW BAILEY, Attorney General  
of the State of Missouri, in his official capacity,

Defendants-Appellants.

No. 23-1457

**UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR 7-DAY FURTHER EXTENSION  
OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSE BRIEF**

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 26(b) and 27, the United States respectfully moves for a 7-day further extension of time, to and including August 9, 2023, in which to file its response brief on appeal. Defendants-appellants State of Missouri *et al.* do not oppose this request.

1. The United States brought this lawsuit in the Western District of Missouri to enjoin the State of Missouri and its agencies and officials from implementation of Missouri H.B. 85, also known as the Second Amendment Preservation Act. The United States sought summary judgment in its favor, arguing that H.B. 85 is invalid under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The district court granted the government's motion, concluding that H.B. 85 is invalid in its entirety and

enjoining “any and all implementation and enforcement” of the statute. The court entered an administrative stay of its decision pending this Court’s consideration of an appellate stay motion. Defendants-appellants then moved in this Court for a stay pending appeal, which the United States opposed on March 17, 2023.

2. Appellants’ opening brief was originally due by May 1, 2023. After receiving one extension from this Court, appellants’ opening brief was accepted for filing on May 11, 2023.

3. The United States’ response brief was originally due by June 12, 2023. This Court extended that deadline by 30 days until July 12, 2023, and on June 29, 2023, this Court further extended that deadline by 21 days until August 2, 2023.

4. The requested 7-day further extension is necessary to ensure adequate time for counsel to consult within the federal government and to prepare and file the United States’ response brief.

The attorney with primary responsibility for this matter is Jeffrey E. Sandberg of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division, Appellate Staff. Mr. Sandberg has remained occupied with other appellate litigation, including, *inter alia*, *Office of the United States Trustee v. John Q. Hammons Fall 2006, LLC*, No. 22-1238 (S. Ct.) (petition for writ of certiorari filed June 23, 2023); *Harrington v. Clinton Nurseries, Inc.*, No. 23-47 (S. Ct.) (petition for writ of certiorari filed July 14, 2023); and *American Reliable Insurance Co. et al. v. United States*, Nos. 22-6014 & 23-5439

(6th Cir.) (response brief on consolidated cross appeals due by July 31, 2013, as extended).

The attorney with principal supervisory responsibility for this appeal is Abby Wright of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division, Appellate Staff. Ms. Wright also has supervisory responsibility for numerous other matters, including *BNSF Railway Co. v. Federal Railroad Administration*, No. 22-60217 (5th Cir.) (supplemental briefs filed July 6, 2023 and July 14, 2023); *VanDerStok v. Garland*, No. 23-10718 (5th Cir.) (motion for stay pending appeal filed July 18, 2023; reply filed July 21, 2023; and opening brief on expedited appeal due by August 9, 2023); *Deanda v. Becerra*, No. 23-10159 (5th Cir.) (reply brief due by July 28, 2023, as extended); and several internal matters. In addition, Ms. Wright will be taking previously scheduled annual leave from July 27-30, 2023.

Michael Raab, also of the Appellate Staff, is also supervising this appeal. Among other matters, Mr. Raab also has supervisory responsibility for *Borja v. Nago*, No. 22-16742 (9th Cir.) (response brief filed July 24, 2023) and *State of Texas v. Becerra*, No. 23-10246 (5th Cir.) (reply brief due by August 4, 2023, as extended).

5. We have consulted with counsel for defendants-appellants, who have authorized us to state that they do not oppose the requested extension.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the United States' unopposed motion for a 7-day further extension of time, to and including August 9, 2023, in which to file its response brief should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL S. RAAB

ABBY C. WRIGHT

/s/ Jeffrey E. Sandberg

JEFFREY E. SANDBERG

Attorneys, Civil Division, Appellate Staff

U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Rm. 7214

Washington, DC 20530

Phone: (202) 532-4453

jeffrey.e.sandberg@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellee*

*United States of America*

July 25, 2023

### **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing motion complies with the type-volume limit of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2)(A) because it contains 627 words, according to the count of Microsoft Word. The motion complies with Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(1)(E) because it has been prepared in 14-point Calisto MT, a proportionally spaced typeface.

/s/ Jeffrey E. Sandberg  
Jeffrey E. Sandberg  
*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellee*  
*United States of America*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on July 25, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing motion with the Clerk of Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system. The participants in this case are registered CM/ECF users, and service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ Jeffrey E. Sandberg  
Jeffrey E. Sandberg  
*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellee*  
*United States of America*